THE ENGLISH CATHOLIC.

The Quarterly Gazette of the Anglican Society.

AUTUMN, 1944. **[WARTIME EDITION. 6d.]** **Vol. 15. No. 59**

President: The Revd. H. ADEANE BYARD, The Vicarage, Newport Pagnell, Bucks.
General Secretary & Hon. Treasurer: The Revd. G. B. TIMMS, 341 London Road, Reading.
Editor: The Revd. A. W. BLANCHETT, Chadlington, Oxford.
Diocesan Organizing Secretaries: See the General Secretary's Notes.
America: The Revd. CHARLES E. HILL, Christ Church Rectory, Ballston Spa, New York.

THE OBJECTS OF THE SOCIETY ARE: 1.—To promote and preserve the Catholic Faith in strict accordance with the principles laid down by the Book of Common Prayer. 2.—To uphold and appreciate the English use, both in rite and ceremonial.

All who are in sympathy with the Objects of the Society are invited to communicate with the General Secretary. Annual subscription for members, 3/6, which includes subscription to the *English Catholic* (2/- per annum, post free).

THE GENERAL SECRETARY'S NOTES.

Members will notice that there is no publication in this issue of the Annual Reports and Financial Statement, which for the past two years have been presented to, and approved by, the Emergency Committee at a meeting in June or July. This is because the favourable war situation encouraged the Committee to hope that it might be possible to arrange for an Annual General Meeting before the end of the year. The advent of the flying bomb extinguished this hope for a time, but now renewed efforts are being made to find a convenient time and place. If these plans materialise, members will be notified.

As a result of the appeal in a recent issue, several new Diocesan Representatives have been appointed. It seems, therefore, a suitable opportunity for reprinting the full list as follows :—

Bath and Wells—The Revd. H. J. THOMAS, The Rectory, Street, Somerset.

Bradford & Wakefield—The Revd. ROBERT TINDALL, St. Andrew's Vicarage, Yeadon, Leeds.

Carlisle—The Revd. K. F. MORRIS, Ennerdale Vicarage, Cleator, Cumberland.

Chichester—The Revd. G. HENNIKER-GOTLEY, Wivelsfield Vicarage, Hayward's Heath, Sussex.

Derby—The Revd. R. F. BOROUGH, Bradburne Vicarage, Ashbourne, Derbyshire.

St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich—The Revd. G. H. HARRIS, Uggeshall Rectory, Beccles, Suffolk.

Gloucester—The Revd. A. G. ENSOR, Westcote Rectory, Kingham, Oxon.

Guildford—The Revd. G. O. APTHORP, Braidley, Wrecclesham, Farnham, Surrey.

Lichfield—The Revd. W. C. A. POVEY, 12 Hugo Street, Leek, Staffs.

London—The Revd. C. E. POCKNEE, The Parsonage, Wimborne Avenue, Hayes, Middlesex.

Norwich—The Revd. H. A. KING, Holt Rectory, Norfolk.

Oxford—The Revd. J. E. BOWLES, 11 St. Peter's Hill, Caversham, Reading.

Rochester—The Revd. J. B. GOODCHILD, Bridge House, Aylesford, Kent.

Southwark—The Revd. N. W. GOWING, Stone House, Chichele Road, Oxted, Surrey.

Winchester—The Revd. W. E. NORRIS, St. Luke's Vicarage, Roslin Road, Bournemouth.

"LOOK UNTO THE ROCK WHENCE YE WERE HEWN."

The Anglo-Catholic movement of to-day claims to be the heir to the Oxford Movement and the custodian of the Tractarian tradition within the Church of England. In view of the uncritical assimilation by modern Anglo-Catholicism of much present day Roman Catholic practice and teaching, we ask, how far is the claim justified? We publish herewith the first of a series of letters written by eminent leaders of the Tractarian movement in which the writers plainly state their objections to certain Roman Catholic practices and their adoption by the Church of England. These letters first appeared in Volume III of "Hierurgia Anglicana," edited by the late Vernon Staley. Mrs. Staley—his widow—has kindly given permission for these letters to be re-produced in *The English Catholic.*

CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD.

MY DEAR . . ., *June* 13, 1882.

I think that the attending Roman Services in England is quite unjustifiable, that the substituting an image of the B. Virgin for the Crucifix is profane.

There is absolutely no authority in the early Church for reservation except for the sick, nor for the placing the Blessed Sacrament in a monstrance or censing, still less of the blessing the people with It. This last seems to me a most unjustifiable use of the Presence which He vouchsafes us. He gave it for one end. He has never authorized us to use His gracious Presence for another. No one has told us that He does bless us so.

It is this imitation of modern practices in the Roman Communion which repels people from us. It was a panic from things much less than this, which brought upon us the P.W.R. Act. That panic still exists.

I agree with you entirely that our Blessed Lord instituted the Sacrament to give us His Body and Blood, and that we might plead the memorial of His sacrifice, that adoration is a natural result of that Presence, but not the object of the institution, and that reservation for the purpose of adoration is not according to primitive usage which we profess to follow.

E. B. PUSEY.

THE TRAINING OF THE CLERGY.

The English have always distrusted professionals and experts. For centuries "standing armies" were a bugbear: as late as 1855 Tennyson expected that "The smooth-faced snub-nosed rogue would leap from his counter and till," without any training, to repel an invading fleet! John Bull has learned by experience that he must have professional men trained: but he still dislikes a professional clergy, partly out of conservatism, always most active in religious matters, and partly because he knows less about religion than almost anything else! But one of the gravest weaknesses of the Church is that the clergy are not sufficiently trained, and that many of them don't know their job. We have all met priests who had no clear ideas about Christian doctrine or morals, or who could not teach, or who could not be heard either at the altar or in the pulpit, or who did not even know the right way to take a wedding.

The experience of other communions does not help us much. The Romanist and the Presbyterian ministries are more highly trained than ours, but their duties differ considerably from those of the Anglican ministry, and are probably much more stereotyped. We need different kinds of priests for town and country, educated and uneducated, "high," "low," and "moderate," North and South: add to these and many other differences the needs of the Dominions, the Colonies, the Mission Field, the Forces, the Continental and Indian chaplaincies, the prisons and asylums, the Student Christian Movement, theological colleges, public schools, religious orders, etc., and it will be evident that there is no kind of knowledge, or previous experience, or level of culture, which cannot be usefully employed in the ministry of the Church of England.

Partly because of this variety, and partly

because of the widespread ignorance of the Christian religion, there is no general agreement as to what a clergyman is for. The philosophers think all priests should study philosophy, the psychologists psychology, the social reformers economics. Some vicars want a man to organize the young, others a skilled ceremonialist, others an expert in sociology, and so on. All these things, and many others, are useful. But what must every priest, because he is a priest, be and know?

First, he must be a man of real devotion, whose only object in seeking Holy Orders is to do God's Will. But untrained devotion is not enough; he must learn how to use the various means of grace, including the more difficult ones, such as meditation. Then, he must have the power of leadership, which implies a strong personality; the devout and regular server, the delight of his vicar, is not necessarily suitable for the priesthood! But this power needs to be tested: there are men who can lead others, but not being able to control themselves, only succeed in leading others astray. The candidate for the priesthood must have not only a strong but an unblemished character. Then he must know his Bible and his Prayer-Book, and how to use them. He need not be an expert in Biblical criticism (though he must know how it has affected Bible study), but he must know the Faith and how to prove it from the Bible, and the general principles of Christian morals, (and enough about casuistry to know when to consult an expert). And he must be able to teach these things to others: every priest must be a teacher, 2 Chron. xv. 3, Mal. ii. 7. He must have a real love of the souls of men, and be able to work with different kinds of people; there is no place in the priesthood for self-centred piety, or for the use of the ceremonies of the Church as a means of self-expression. He need not be an expert ritualist, but he must know the right way to take the services (which cannot be learned from books alone), and he must be able to make himself heard without straining his voice, which requires expert guidance. Unless he is tone-deaf (which is uncommon), he must be able to sing ordinary services in tune. He must know enough about Church History to understand doctrine, and current ecclesiastical questions, and the meaning of saints' days: if possible, he must know enough Greek to use the New Testament in the original language, and the best commentaries on it. The Church needs all the scholars and experts she can get (though she does not always know how to make the best use of them); but what she needs still more is "general practitioners," men who are willing to go anywhere and do anything, and who can be relied upon to do the ordinary work of a priest with competence. There is only one way to ensure that every priest shall possess the necessary minimum; to insist that no one, whatever his age or previous experience, shall be ordained without passing through a theological college.

The bishops, however, have long pursued a different ideal; that no one should be ordained without an university degree; which the new Report on the Training of the Ministry also supports. This ideal is false. The Bishop of Bath and Wells put his finger on the fallacy, when he said in Convocation that the report seemed to be addressed only to those who were to minister to the "intelligentsia." Very few priests have to do this. Most of us, in the early years of our ministry, have to learn to put what we have read into language which can be understood by people whose only reading is the Sunday papers!

By all means let those who can profit by an university education have it. But there will always be some whose approach is not intellectual, and whom it would be sheer waste of time and money to send to an university. Even those who go to an university must not be allowed to regard it as a substitute for the theological college. The functions of the two are different. Universities are rightly open to men of all religions and of none; for that very reason they cannot speak for the Church. It is the theological college alone which can say to a man, as it ought to be entirely free to say to him at any moment, "Without in any way blaming you, we do not think you suitable for the priesthood, and we advise you to seek some other calling." It is the theological college alone which can say with authority, "You must, as a member of the Church, believe that this is true and that is false," and which can deliver theological statements as truths to be believed, and not merely as opinions to be known.

The proposal of the Report, that theological colleges should usually be placed in university towns, in order to use university lectures, and even co-operate with other

denominations, ignores this distinction. The university is inclusive : its members are, rightly, in contact with many kinds of men. But the theological college must be exclusive; because its members must, at that stage, cut themselves off from outside interests, and give their whole attention to one thing only. Universities are rightly full of societies and meetings on every possible subject : it is unfair to throw on the discipline of the theological college, and on the consciences of its members, the strain of keeping away from activities, which are right for other students, and even for themselves at a different stage, but wrong at this stage. Moreover the academic, controversial, and probably sceptical atmosphere of an university, especially a modern one, is precisely what the theological college ought most to avoid.

Still more disastrous is the suggestion that groups of theological colleges, of different denominations, should find a common centre of worship in interdenominational services. It is good that candidates for ordination should learn how other Christians worship. But their own devotional life must be based on the Prayer-Book, and especially on the Eucharist, which in the Prayer-Book, as in every other Catholic liturgical book, is the centre and focus of all worship, public and private. Moreover, ordinands in England have no opportunity of seeing Christian worship as a whole in its right proportions. The Eastern communions, and Lutheranism, hardly exist here at all. Closer relations with the Romanists, even if possible, would be undesirable, because we cannot expect the Romanists not to try to proselytize. Only the so-called "Free Churches" are left. But these are the extreme left wing of Christendom. Close association with them only, in the theological college stage, as suggested by the Report, could only lead to further watering down of the doctrine and worship of the Church, which is already gravely compromised, or else, in some cases, to violent reaction against all friendliness towards them, which would be equally unfortunate. Admirable as is the work of the Student Christian Movement, it has very serious limitations. The rise of a generation of priests whose ideals of worship were modelled on the camp services at Swanwick, would be a disaster !

Two other subjects must be briefly discussed : limitation of the bishops' choice, and the future of the Diaconate. Bishops are always being pressed to ordain men of doubtful competence ; and, as staffs of theological colleges know, there are always a few bishops who will ordain practically anything in trousers ! It is not the intention of the Church, ancient or modern, that a bishop should have unlimited freedom to ordain whom he pleases ; but no examination by itself is a sufficient check. There are some excellent candidates who cannot pass exams. ; and some who have passed them ought to be kept from ordination at any price ! The Regional Committees proposed by the Report are apparently intended to limit the choice of the bishops. I am not sure that this is the best way to do it ; but in some way it must be done, if the ministry is not to be flooded with men insufficiently trained and men whom no amount of training would ever make competent priests.

The Anglican diaconate is the last stage of training for the priesthood, and must remain so. The Report rightly rejects suggestions for a prolonged or permanent diaconate : but it does not attempt the necessary drastic alteration of the present methods, under which a vicar may offer a title, not because he has the time or ability to train a deacon, but because he can't get an assistant priest, or can't afford one, or can't induce one to stay two years ! No one should be allowed to take a deacon, unless he can and will train him ; and in that training, the deacon's future, and not the work to be done, should be the first consideration. Many a good man has lost the habit of reading, and some have broken down in health, through overwork in their diaconate. Deacons preach far too many sermons ; no young deacon should be allowed to preach more than, at most, once a fortnight. I doubt whether deacons will ever be properly trained, until the diaconate, is separated from the title to the priesthood and treated in some other way (but *not* in the theological college, as in the Roman Communion, which would not suit our conditions).

C. B. Moss.

THE PRAYER OF OBLATION.

A Criticism

In recent years there has been a widespread suggestion that the Consecration Prayer in the 1662 Rite could be enlarged and brought into line with other liturgies by tacking on to the end of that Prayer the first of the Post-Communion Prayers, which is commonly called the Prayer of Oblation. Concerning such a proposal the late Dr. Frere has written in his work, *The Anaphora*, as follows, "This rough surgery may very naturally have seemed as a bit of 'first aid,' better than nothing, and even a useful step to a proper healing, so long as there seemed to be no immediate prospect of a real recovery . . . the fundamental objections to such a half-measure soon came into view; and it inevitably became clear that the only real recovery could be through the replacement of the Anamnesis."

As the proposal to join the Prayer of Oblation immediately on to the 1662 Eucharistic Prayer has seriously been considered by Convocation only recently; it may be well to state more fully why this proposal cannot be regarded as a satisfactory permanent solution in connection with a fuller form of Anaphora or Prayer of Consecration.

The so-called Prayer of Oblation, as we now have it in the Rite of 1662, is a *truncated* form of the second part of 1549 Eucharistic Prayer. Because in the 1549 Liturgy after the Dominical words, "Do this, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me," there follow phrases of very great importance; "Wherefore, O Lord, and heavenly Father, according to the institution of thy dearly beloved Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, we thy humble servants, do celebrate and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, the memorial which thy Son hath willed us to make; having in remembrance His blessed Passion, mighty Resurrection and glorious Ascension." It is the Anamnesis or memorial of the Passion, Resurrection and Ascension, which finds no place in the so-called Prayer of Oblation in the Rite of 1662. This is a serious loss, and it is not merely a loss in words that is involved but also a loss in Eucharistic theology. It seems hardly likely that Cranmer and his collaborators were unaware that almost all the ancient liturgies have an Anamnesis of the Passion, Resurrection and Ascension, following on the rehearsal of the narrative of the Institution of the Eucharist.

In this respect both East and West are at one; for the Roman Canon of the Mass and the Anaphora of St. John Chrysostom both make mention of the Passion, Resurrection and Ascension immediately after the celebrant has rehearsed the Institution of the Sacrament. Behind such prayers of course, there lies the important fact that, the Church pleads before the Father the entire work of Christ and not the Cross alone. The tendency to isolate the Death of our Lord and make that fact the sole cause of the Eucharistic memorial is certainly neither Catholic nor Evangelical in the fullest sense. We must say therefore that the proposal to join on the Prayer of Oblation to the 1662 anaphora would do nothing to remedy what is undoubtedly a defect in the English Liturgy.

It has been maintained in certain quarters that Eastern theology emphasizes the Resurrection and Ascension in the Eucharist, while Latin theology stresses the Cross. This may be so in popular devotions; but in the official Liturgy, as we have pointed out, Rome and Constantinople are at one. A Roman Catholic writer, Dom Theodore Wesseling, in his recently published book, *Liturgy and Life*, makes the following comment: 'Having thus seen that the Redeeming-Act from Incarnation to Ascension is something entirely one . . . we cannot cut it into parts like a piece of meat or a loaf. Therefore, if the principal part is present, (in the Mass) all the other parts of the Redeeming-Act are present as well, from the Incarnation to the Ascension." (p. 25).

In the traditional liturgies the Anamnesis of the Passion, Resurrection and Ascension is followed by the Oblation or offering of the Sacred Gifts of Bread and Wine. Here once more Latin and Orthodox Rites find common ground. Thus Rome says, "Mindful of the blessed Passion of the same thy Son our Lord, his Resurrection from the dead and also his glorious Ascension into Heaven, Offer . . . of thy gifts and favours etc." The Liturgies of St. John Chrysostom and St. Basil take the same structure, i.e., the Anamnesis is followed by

the offering of the Holy Gifts. This is as it should be, the Church sets before the Father the memorial of Christ Crucified, Risen and Ascended; and by virtue of that work she then proceeds to offer the Holy Gifts, thus literally offering them "Through Jesus Christ our Lord."

When we examine the 1549 Eucharistic Prayer however, we find some confusion of thought has taken place in the mind of the compiler; and the order of Anamnesis followed by offering has become inverted, and we have instead the memorial preceded by the oblation. The gifts are offered before the cause of offering has been stated. We have already quoted this part of the 1549 Prayer and a reference to this will make this point clear. This curious inversion of structure has unfortunately been perpetuated in the Scottish Eucharistic Prayer and in that of the American Rite. The more recent revisions of the Liturgy in South Africa, Ceylon and India have reverted to the proper order of Anamnesis followed by Oblation.* The English Liturgy of 1928 has, too, restored the proper order.

C. E. POCKNEE.

*Anglican Liturgies [O.U.P.], Complied by J. H. Arnold, gives all these liturgies.

THE LECTIONARY.

There is some talk of a new revision of the Lectionary. Whether this is really necessary may be doubted; the present one is surely superior to its predecessors, though use has certainly shewn up some minor defects.

But, if a revision is attempted, it is to be hoped that it will be carried out on definite principles as regards two of its main parts—viz., the week-day course, and the Sunday lessons. The object of the former has always been to provide for as complete a use of the scriptures as is practicable and convenient. But, as regards the Sunday lessons, it may be suggested that if a change is to be made it should be rather drastic, owing to the circumstances of the day. For the striking and ominous fact is the loss of the habit of reading or using the Bible. Even among church-goers it is probable that for many the only opportunity they take of making acquaintance with the Contents of the Bible is hearing the lessons read at Mattins and Evensong, or more probably Mattins or Evensong. Ought not therefore the aim to be to choose for this purpose the most vitally important portions of the Scriptures? Otherwise a valuable opportunity will be lost. Does not this consideration suggest that for the Sunday lessons as a rule only the New Testament should be read—one lesson from the Gospels and one from the Acts or the Epistles? Of course some of the Old Testament narratives supply excellent subjects for sermons, but this is a minor consideration compared with the desirability of making the best possible use of what is really a very essential opportunity.

The general ignorance to-day of everything pertaining to our holy religion is appalling, and surely we ought to make the best possible use of this opportunity of making our own Church people at least familiar with the most vitally important truths of our religion.

E. G. P. WYATT.

BOOKS REVIEWED.

"THE FORM OF THE CHURCH," by A. G. Hebert. [Faber and Faber, 8/6.]

In this admirable and timely book Father Hebert distinguishes between "form" in the popular sense of "shape," and "form" in the scholastic and Aristotelian sense of "that which makes a thing to be what it is, and moulds the matter of which it is also composed, so that the growth of the thing towards the perfection of its being is the actualization of its form." In this sense the Church has certain features of Divine origin, without which it would cease to be what it is, and which are to be carefully distinguished from those features which are only human and which therefore may be changed. Father Hebert discusses the

Bible, the Creeds, the Sacraments, and the Ministry, from this point of view. He emphasizes precisely what ought to be emphasized, and draws the distinctions which are so often ignored: and he applies the principle to the four "notes" of the Church, Unity, Holiness, Catholicity, Apostolicity. For instance, it is essential to the Church to have a ministry with apostolic authority; it is not essential (though highly expedient) that that ministry should be threefold. He points out that "The Free Church Ministries mean something different from the Catholic Ministry"; they are not rivals to it, but complementary to it.

Unfortunately the book is spoilt by a paragraph on p. 101, in which the author asserts that "it is round Rome as the centre that Christendom must some day be reunited." It is true that in the pages which follow he shows that the great defect of Rome is that it "blurs the vital distinction between the human and the Divine elements in the Church: "the Roman Bishop can never rightly be called Christ's Vicar, as if he were taking the place of Christ and of the Holy Ghost." But he does not perceive that the whole history of Rome, both Imperial and Papal, makes it the one place which can never be accepted as a centre by all Christendom, even if the very existence of such a centre were not contrary to the New Testament: nor that the decrees of Trent are not (p. 107—8) "a secondary form expressing the mind of the Church," but include various errors which must be rejected if the Church is ever to be united. It is a great pity that so excellent a book should contain passages so inconsistent with its general tenour.

C. B. Moss.

"Handbook to the Christian Liturgy," by James Norman. [S.P.C.K., 10/6.]

Students of liturgy and others who wish to understand the growth and development of Christian worship will find much of the information they need has been collected and documented in this book. The writer uses the term "liturgy" in its strictest sense and applies it to the service of the Eucharist. In the first part of the book we are given survey of the growth of the liturgy from the New Testament into the various families or types of liturgy. Full cognizance has been taken by Mr. Norman of recent research on the subject. Thus the "Apostolic Traditions of Hippolytus" with its Eucharistic Prayer dating about 200 A.D., is fully dealt with.

In the second part of this book we are given a commentary on the numerous parts of the Christian liturgy. We are able to see at a glance when a particular feature was introduced into the Eucharist and the variant forms to be found in the different types of liturgy. Thus in dealing with the "Benedictus qui venit" it is easy to see that it was not used in the Apostolic Constitutions or in the Alexandrian liturgy. Neither was it in use in Rome in the ninth century as Ordo I of that period testifies.

On page 301 there is evidently an error. For the dismissal at Rome is ascribed to the priest. As is well-known "ite missa est" has always been said in the Latin Rite by one of the deacons.

CORRESPONDENCE.

The Prodigal Son.

Sir,—In reply to Mr. Wyatt, I frankly admit that I was ignorantly unaware of the interpretation he prefers to put upon the incident of the Elder Brother. It is a very interesting one, and I must thank Mr. Wyatt for drawing my attention to it.

At the same time, I am sure that Mr. Wyatt will not resent my saying that I still adhere to the more generally accepted explanation. (1) Like the two parables immediately preceding it, that of the Prodigal Son was evidently by way of reply to the self-righteous people who found fault with our Lord for consorting with "sinners" (Lk. xv, 1 ff.). (2) Mr. Wyatt says that "to the elder brother the promise is made, 'Son, thou art ever with me, and all that I have is thine.'" But why does he term this a promise? Was not the father stating a present fact? He had already given the younger brother his share of the inheritance, and therefore all that was left was the elder brother's portion. I think I am correct in saying that it was a not uncommon practice among the Jews for an old man to divide the patrimony among his children prior to his death, on the understanding that they would support him during the remainder of his life. (3) Mr. Wyatt concludes: "How could it be said of the Scribes and Pharisees and of the Jews generally that they had never at any time transgressed God's commandments?" Granted that it could not be said of them, yet it

was the kind of thing that some of them said of themselves (*cf.* the parable of the Publican and the Pharisee), as did the elder brother of himself. And it was just this spirit of self-righteousness that our Lord condemned so strongly. " When ye shall have done all the things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants ; we have done that which it was our duty to do." (Lk. xvii, 10).

G. F. POLLARD.

THE REVISED MARRIAGE SERVICE.

SIR,—There is one change in the Revised Marriage Service to which Dr. Moss does not refer, although it seems to me it can hardly be regarded as an improvement, namely the substitution of the word *share* for *endow* in the bridegroom's marriage formula. On showing the Revised Service to a solicitor he said to me at once : " The word *share* is meaningless here. Its true meaning is to *apportion out* or *divide up* and so in the Revised Service it looks as though the couple are about to divorce and not marry ; and the bridegroom divide up his property. Legally the old service was perfectly correct—an endowment on the husband's property is exactly what the bride does get at her marriage. So why change it ?"

Yours etc., E. G. BENSON,

15 *July*, 1944. *Burghill, Hereford.*

DOMINUS VOBISCUM.

SIR,—" The Lord be with you " after the Kyries, before the Gospel and before the Lord's Prayer, is not so " silly " as might appear from Professor Rogers' notes.

If the first Pater Noster and the Collect for Purity are in the nature of a preparation ; and if the Deacon or a Cantor lead the Kyries, then it is quite becoming for the Celebrant to say " The Lord be with you " before he continues with the mass proper. Such an ejaculation focuses attention upon him, as it is intended to do. That has been recognized in the 1928 Prayer Book.

Similarly the Deacon, *before* he announces the Gospel (not after doing so) should claim our attention by the words " The Lord be with you."

Similarly also, if the Lord's Prayer be in its original place—i.e. after the Communion of the people and not " at the climax of the canon "—then it is most fitting for the celebrant to recall the faithful from private devotion to corporate worship with the words " The Lord be with you."

Yours truly, J. B. GOODCHILD.

FORGOTTEN CEREMONIES OF THE PRAYER BOOK.

SIR,—I find it impossible to follow Mr. Staniforth's reasoning about the Easter Anthems being a sort of authority for the revival of the solemn bringing back of the reserved Eucharist from the sepulchre to the high altar. In the first place these anthems are now quite definitely to be substituted for the Venite at mattins. In the 1549 Prayer Book where they were ordered to be used before mattins there is no sign of any intention to include any part of the sepulchre ceremonies. Moreover, the bringing back of the Eucharist from the sepulchre implies its having been ceremonially placed there, and for this we have no authority in the present rite. These dramatic ceremonies of Holy Week may or may not be desirable to revive. But seeing that the handling of the Eucharist is involved it would appear to be a great irregularity to do it without episcopal authority at the very least. The ceremony in question was not universal in England until about a century before the reformation period ; though followed at Sarum we know it was a late introduction into the Hereford use. And like many things of the kind it is only mediaeval, and cannot be claimed as of Catholic obligation. The revival of observances of this kind under the plea that they have English precedent makes those in authority and a large section of our people inclined to say that we who claim to follow the Prayer Book and the English Use are just as unreasonable as those who put equally strained interpretations on our formularies in defence of what they call " Western Use."

" The Church hath authority to decree rites and ceremonies," and therefore competent authority can and should do a great deal to supplement the Prayer Book. But this is a very different matter from claiming that the existing rite covers practices which are certainly not intended by it. If the " English " position is to be respected and to achieve success it can only be on the line of the straightforward following of the rite for all purposes to which it applies, and the subordination of ceremonial to text.

Yours faithfully,

F. C. EELES.

Earlham, Dunster, Somerset.

Printed and published by A. T. BROOME & SON, The Cherwell Press, St. Clement's Street. Oxford.